

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated January 30, 2006. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claim 9.

Section 112 Rejection

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph. The Office Action Examiner contends that "when the file icon is not located over the print icon" is not supported by the instant specification. This Section 112 is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 1 requires that print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon. Fig. 2 and the instant application at page 11, lines 6-24, clearly illustrate and describe an example where print conditions are displayed in a recognizable form when the file icon is not located over the print icon. Thus, the instant specification supports this claims, and the Section 112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5-8 and 11

Claims 3, 5-8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over at least Fitzpatrick in view of Nagasaka (US 6,697,090). This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed, at least because Nagasaka is not prior art. In particular, Nagasaka was filed on October 2, 2000, which is *after* the May 26, 2000 priority date of the instant application. Thus, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 3, 5-8 and 11 should be withdrawn because Nagasaka is not prior art to these claims.

Claim 1

Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Hemenway. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires that "the print icon is formed so that the display is altered according to a setting of the print conditions in said print icon, and said print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a *recognizable display form* when the file icon is not located over the print icon *the print icon to which the file icon is dragged and dropped is an icon which limits on a specific function amount print processing functions provided in a corresponding printer, and which issues a print command by a function which specifies the file icon for the printer when the file icon is dragged and dropped on the print icon.*" Since print conditions may be displayed in accordance with a shape of a printer icon, when a document file is made dragging and dropping onto a printer icon, the printing conditions can be recognized without a particular operation such as hovering so that efficiency and convenience can be significantly improved in certain example embodiments of this invention. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid underlined aspect of claim 1.

Hemenway discloses a technique related to an icon display by utilizing a mouse, wherein a dropped file icon of a file is moved by a user onto a desired folder, icon or window on a display. Fitzpatrick discloses a technique related to issuing a print command of a file to a printer by dropping a dragged file icon by a mouse operation onto a print icon. In particular, in Fitzpatrick when a file icon is superposed on a print icon a window picture for parameter setting of the printer is displayed so that it becomes possible to identify print conditions.

Claim 1 requires that *the print icon to which the file icon is dragged and dropped is an icon which limits on a specific function amount print processing functions provided in a corresponding printer, and a print command is issued by a function which specifies the file icon for the printer when the file icon is dragged and dropped on the print icon*. On the other hand, Hemenway/Fitzpatrick merely disclose techniques where a file icon of a file is dragged and dropped onto a print icon and then printing command of the file is used to the printer. That is to say, *the print icons of Hemenway/Fitzpatrick are short-cut icons for accessing the printer, which do not issue a printing command to the printer with a specific print condition as required by claim 1*. Thus, even the alleged combination (which applicant believes would be incorrect in any event) still fails to meet the invention of claim 1.

Furthermore, Fitzpatrick discloses that a dragged document icon is hovered over a print icon for a few seconds. By continued hovering of the document icon over/on the print icon, a dialog box for altering print conditions is displayed. Thus, Fitzpatrick discloses that print conditions are displayed when a certain operation is made on a printer icon, but that print conditions cannot be recognized unless the operation is carried out. In particular, in Fitzpatrick print conditions are displayed *only* when such hovering over/on the print icon is performed. Accordingly, it can be seen that Fitzpatrick *fails* to disclose or suggest that print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a *recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon* as required by claim 1. Instead, Fitzpatrick teaches directly away from this aspect of claim 1 and cannot render the same unpatentable. In this respect, Hemenway also fails to disclose or suggest that "print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a *recognizable display form* when the file icon is not located over the print icon" as required by claim 1. Hemenway discloses that print conditions are displayed on a different window; hence it

NAKAI et al.
Appl. No. 09/833,651
May 1, 2006


is very inconvenient for recognizing when dragging and dropping is carried out. Since both cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the "recognizable display form" aspect of claim 1, then even the alleged combination (which is incorrect in any event) fails to meet the invention of claim 1 for this additional reason.

Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100